DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 580 CE 015 246

TITLE A Monitoring and Assessment Plan for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977.
INSTITUTION Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; Demonstration Projects; *Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; Job Training; *Organization; *Program Administration; Program Coordination; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Quality Control; Time Perspective; Youth Employment; Youth Opportunities; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act

ABSTRACT

Intended as a general blueprint for monitoring and assessing activities under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, this document discusses the expected constraints, evaluation and assessment tools, the analytic framework, and monitoring and review schedule. Five problem areas are recognized as potential constraints in implementation of the project activities. To minimize these problems, a complete spectrum of analytic tools is suggested, including the following assessment and evaluation approaches: office of youth programs issue papers, grant narratives, program data, continuous longitudinal manpower survey, national longitudinal survey, outside monitoring and assessment network, regional office assessment reviews, national office reviews, and impact assessments. The analytical framework suggested is based on ten basic principles, assumptions, and goals which include the following elements: knowledge development, youth participation, serving those most in need, avoiding substitution, minimizing overhead, institutional change, service deliverers, program integration, and implementation. Finally a detailed schedule for the implementation of the assessment efforts is presented. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Monitoring and Assessment Plan for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration
Ernest G. Green, Assistant Secretary

1977

ED151580

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 015 246

Material contained in this publication is in the public domain and may be reproduced, fully or partially, without permission of the Federal Government. Source credit is requested but not required. Permission is required only to reproduce any copyrighted material contained herein.

This plan is subject to further revision as new needs are perceived or obstacles encountered in implementation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

The Constraints

Evaluation and Assessment Tools

1. Office of Youth Programs Issue Papers
2. Grant Narratives
3. Program Data
4. Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS)
5. National Longitudinal Survey
6. Outside Monitoring and Assessment Network
7. Regional Office Assessment Reviews
8. National Office Reviews
9. Impact Assessments

The Analytic Framework

Monitoring and Review Schedule

Background

Monitoring and evaluation provide the informational basis for knowledge development, indicating for program activities how many and who are served, the mix of services provided, the costs, administrative arrangements, institutional change impacts and, most importantly, the outcomes for participants, both short-run and long-run. The ultimate aim is to insure that resources are distributed equitably and efficiently among potential claimants, that the types of services offered are most appropriate for the individuals selected, that activities are administered fairly and effectively, that benefits are maximized and costs minimized.

Timely assessments are crucial in new operational programs to identify correctable problems and to assure that legislative mandates are being met. Longer-range evaluations are needed to determine whether the benefits warrant costs. Assessments are equally important for demonstration efforts to test the efficacy of the new approaches which are being tried. The Knowledge Development Plan, developed by the Office of Youth Programs, outlines a structured set of demonstration efforts in addition to theoretical studies and other learning activities. It also lists a number of evaluations which will be funded with discretionary resources. Basic policy questions are enumerated in the Plan, with indications of how these will be addressed under the formula-funded and demonstration programs through a synthesis of the findings of the separate assessments. If the policy questions are to be resolved, the findings must be accurate, timely, comprehensive and detailed. This monitoring and assessment plan indicates how this accuracy, timeliness, comprehensiveness and detail will be assured.

The Constraints

Evaluations of employment and training programs far surpass those in other social welfare areas in terms of scope and sophistication, but they still leave much to be desired. There are inherent constraints which must be recognized as well as other implementation shortcomings which can be overcome.

First, the evaluation system must not impose unrealistic burdens on operators or extensive costs which detract from employment and training services. The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) is a demonstration program, but it is also part of an economic stimulus package which must be implemented rapidly. Every dollar spent on evaluation is a dollar which does not immediately help those in need, and must be justified in terms of likely future improvements in effectiveness.

Second, new activities are not easily evaluated. It is not clear at the outset which issues will become important. There is uncertainty about how to assess the initial results. The effects of phase-in problems must be separated from dimensions of performance inherent in the program approaches.

Third, there must be a balance between immediate feedback of operational developments, assessment of short-run impacts, and determination of the longer-run effects. Improvements should be made as rapidly as possible but constant programmatic adjustments obfuscate early outcomes. Immediate impacts, for instance, placement rates, may or may not be reflective of long-run impacts.

Fourth, a variety of perspectives must be taken. Implicit in any evaluation is a set of assumptions or hypotheses. In dealing with such a complex subject as youth development and the broad range of institutions involved, it is necessary to view the activities from many different angles. There must be independent as well as internal assessments, locally focused as well as nationally focused, quantitative as well as as qualitative.

Fifth, activities must be evaluated both in isolation and in context. This is especially true where a range of services may be provided. The entire package and delivery mechanism must be analyzed with consideration of the institutional and economic environment, yet it is also crucial to focus on separate service components.

To minimize these problems, a complete spectrum of analytic tools should be utilized. These should be refined and adapted to the specific tasks at hand. Second, a strategy must be developed to coordinate and structure the separate assessments. This paper outlines the major elements of the monitoring and review efforts. Further details will be provided as they are developed.

Evaluation and Assessment Tools

A complete range of assessment and evaluation approaches will be utilized to study the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act.

1. Office of Youth Programs Issue Papers: The principles articulated in the Program Planning Charter must be applied through regulations, enforcement actions, the use of discretionary resources and policy pronouncements. These administrative decisions must respond to experience to changing external conditions and program experience. In

order to evaluate performance, it is necessary to understand the ongoing decisionmaking process and the background factors. In other words, a necessary foundation for any evaluation is an understanding of the policy goals and directions, which are continually adjusted. The Office of Youth Programs will prepare issue papers on each of the Charter principles, outlining major administrative decisions and explaining the rationale. This will help to sort out subsequent program experience and to provide a report on program evolution from a national perspective.

2. Grant Narratives: The State and local plans for the Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP) and Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP) will establish the basic parameters for local efforts. The narratives will reflect the sophistication and commitment of prime sponsors in these endeavors. The YETP plan calls for an assessment of other youth programs in the prime sponsor area and an identification of model programs, so that it will shed light on the variance in youth employment and training systems nationwide. The narrative will also indicate the procedural steps taken to meet new requirements for LEA-CETA agreements, special consideration for community-based organizations, and greater involvement of labor organizations. Knowledge of such arrangements and procedures is critically important in the first year of a program which aims to forge new linkages. Certain performance goals are to be established locally in the grant narrative, and there is a requirement for an annual review by the prime sponsor. These reviews from across the Nation should indicate the qualitative achievements of the program as perceived by prime sponsors yielding a "grass-roots" view of developments.

3. Program Data: The quarterly data reported by prime sponsors on expenditures, program levels and participant characteristics provide comprehensive and timely information concerning who is being served, in what ways and at what costs. Since so many activities are authorized under YEDPA, it is critically important to summarize the separate decisions made by prime sponsors to determine the overall mix of services. Greater specification is required then in the existing CETA Title I reporting forms, since some new activities are authorized under Title III, Part C. Likewise, the participant charactersitics data needs to be expanded to determine fundamental questions such as how many in-school vs. out-of-school youth are being served, how many are from intact families vs. broken homes, and how many are attracted from other lower paid employment by the availability of minimum wage jobs. The same data base must allow for monitoring and assessment at the regional level, as well as for more detailed evaluations funded or conducted by the national office. For analytic

purposes, it would, of course, be preferable to have information presented on the services received and costs incurred for separate client groups. However, the present reporting system does not provide for such cross-classifications. Experiments are underway in CETA to upgrade data capacities, but most prime sponsors cannot now carry the workload. To impose this in a single segment of CETA, which is authorized for only 1 year, would be unrealistic and overly demanding even if desirable over the long-run in all CETA efforts.

For the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC) program, program data will be provided quarterly on enrollee characteristics and costs. Enrollee data will be important in assessing whether the program is serving those in need, and will allow the Department of Labor to assure that Agriculture and Interior are fulfilling their responsibilities as defined in the interagency agreement. The cost data will receive careful analysis although it will be complicated by the capital costs involved in preparations of camp and project facilities at the outset of the program.

4. Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS): This survey provides more detailed information on participants, the services each receives, and the individual outcomes; and it allows for the cross-classification of such information. An expanded sample will cover YCCIP and YETP nationwide. While there are time lags in the preparation of such information and problems in doing rigorous analysis, the CLMS provides the chief tool for determining inputs and outcomes for like individuals to determine what works best for whom. The existing CLMS questionnaire will be refined by adding some questions applying specifically to the type of individuals being served under YETP. Plans will be made from the outset to trace movements between categorical programs, since this proved to be one of the major difficulties in the previous surveys. A large sample will be utilized to assure adequate sample size. The interviews will be scheduled 1 year apart in light of the finding from CLMS that 6-month followup results are skewed by the special characteristics of early terminees. The interview techniques and data processing refinements developed painfully under CLMS will be used as a foundation. The results should, therefore, be relatively dependable at an earlier stage.

5. National Longitudinal Survey: A new longitudinal survey is being supported with discretionary funds. It will concentrate on disadvantaged youth, especially minorities, and will trace their experiences for 5 years or more. Emphasis will be placed on determining the role and impact of public interventions, including employment and training efforts. A battery of questions will be developed to validate this information. This will yield the first good evidence of how the many programmatic employment

and career development pieces fit together for different youth during their critical transition from school to work. As far as possible, this survey will be made consistent with CLMS and with other evaluation formats.

6. Outside Monitoring and Assessment Network: It is important to have an independent review of programs from the outset which provides timely identification of shortcomings and accomplishments. One approach used with success in evaluating the Public Employment Program (PEP) and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) was to fund an outside organization to support a network of part-time onsite evaluators in selected prime sponsor areas. The Department of Labor has contracted with the National Council on Employment Policy to implement such an evaluation for the first year of the program and the second if YEDPA is reauthorized. This will cover YETP and YCCIP activities and related youth efforts, including such questions as coordination or integration of services or substitution. The aim is not to provide detailed impact measures, but rather a timely analysis of procedures and approaches which are being utilized and a qualitative assessment of whether goals are being met. An independent process evaluation of YACC will also be supported which monitors performed in a range of sites.

7. Regional Office Assessment Reviews: The Employment and Training Administration will seek to use regional field representatives in national assessment efforts. They will be carefully selected on the basis of competence and interest, with selection of those covering a representative sample of prime sponsors. The groups will be provided background information on particular issues, will be brought together to discuss the assessment methodology, and then sent back to review particular aspects of prime sponsors' efforts. Since field representatives have a continuing contact with the prime sponsors, they are likely to have a good understanding of the principals and institutions; their analysis will reflect the view of those responsible for enforcing national office decisions from the regional level.

8. National Office Reviews: The staff of the Office of Youth Programs will be sent to the field to examine specific aspects of prime sponsors' efforts. These site visits will permit a two-way flow of information on a range of subjects but will focus on the issues which are new or of high priority under YEDPA. Monitoring will also be done for the YACC program, focusing on the reasonableness of startup expenditures, the extent of service to all population segments, the efforts to enrich the program and the relationship with SESA's, prime sponsors

and other community organizations. These reviews of YEDPA programs will supplement regional and outside evaluations, providing a diversity of perspectives. While previous in-house reviews have varied in quality, the major drawback has been a timidity in releasing the results, an inability to deliver in a timely fashion, and the dearth or skilled evaluators. The small staff of the Office of Youth Programs will be intensively involved in every detail of YEDPA and will be trained in assessment techniques. Since the programs are clearly experimental, there is an immediate need to examine the results as objectively and straightforwardly as possible--both what works and what does not--so that release of information should not be a problem.

9. Impact Assessments: Careful control group studies are needed to supplement information which will be provided by the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey and from other services. Currently underway are large-scale economic and noneconomic impact studies of the Job Corps. A similarly structured evaluation should be completed for the Young Adult Conservation Corps after a substantial residential component is established in order to test whether the costs of residency are warranted. The Entitlement program, by law, is to be carefully studied to determine the extent that youth return to school or avoid dropping out, the impact on their futures, the feasibility of providing the guaranteed jobs, and the cost implications. This will require a control group study comparing sites with and without Entitlement, as well as like individuals who do and do not receive guaranteed jobs.

A comprehensive set of studies will examine the nature of work under YEDPA, comparing it to other work experience for youth and especially focusing on supervision, attendance, work hours, and discipline. The value of work output for a range of work experience activities will also be measured. Each of the demonstration projects detailed in the Knowledge Development Plan is required to have an approved evaluation design. Every effort is being made to assure that the results of the demonstrations are evaluated consistently with those of the large-scale programs, with comparisons wherever reasonable. Finally, basic research efforts will be undertaken to identify the most realistic and appropriate program outlines and related input measures so that the performance of youth efforts can be better assessed.

The Analytic Framework

It is crucial that there be an organizational structure for these diverse assessments. One approach is to use the framework established in A Planning Charter for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act which articulated

the following basic principles, assumptions and goals as the basis for the Office of Youth Programs' administrative decisions in the design and implementation of the YEDPA:

1. Knowledge development is a primary aim of the new youth programs.

2. The content and quality of work experience must be improved.

3. Youth participation should be emphasized.

4. Resources should go to those in greatest need.

5. Substitution must be avoided.

6. Overhead must be minimized.

7. The new youth programs are not the cutting edge for institutional change.

8. Emphasis must be placed on approaches and delivery agents of demonstrated merit.

9. The development of a separate employment and training delivery system for youth is not encouraged.

10. The new youth programs are not permanent.

Each of these principles, assumptions and goals provides an organizational focus.

Knowledge Development

YEDPA is supposed to be an experimental and demonstration effort at both the national and local levels. The assessment of knowledge development activities would include an analysis of the progress and results of each of the national demonstration programs, as well as an examination of local CETA knowledge development efforts. A fundamental aspect of these prime sponsor efforts is to determine what employment, training and education services are already available for youth so that the new resources can be targeted and coordinated. Prime sponsors are to identify model programs and to support these with YEDPA funds. Prime sponsors are being urged to try different approaches and to establish knowledge development goals locally. They are required to enrich work experience efforts where these do not include adequate supervision and support services. Discretionary funds are to be channeled through the CETA system as much as possible with the results integrated

into local planning and operations. A range of technical assistance materials are being provided by the Department of Labor with the aim of improving the knowledge base locally.

A variety of tools will have to be used to determine whether these results are achieved. The YETP grant narratives are to include the local youth service inventories, the lists of innovative programs, and the local knowledge development goals. Analysis of the narratives will suggest the enthusiasm and sophistication of the CETA system in responding to this new mission locally. The independent, national and regional office site visits should indicate whether qualitative differences are in evidence. The competitions for discretionary funds should surface the most innovative ideas and the process of application through the CETA system should help to assure integration into local planning. The separate evaluations of the national demonstration programs will document progress in this regard. Finally, the effectiveness of technical assistance offerings meeting the needs of prime sponsors will be assessed in a special end-of-the year review of technical assistance offerings.

Work Experience

The nature of the work being funded under YEDPA can be determined from a variety of sources. The data forms will indicate the split between in-school and out-of-school, and will yield estimates of unit costs. The CLMS will identify the types of individuals being served in these work experience components and how work experience is linked to other services. The grant narratives will list the jobs being funded and the wage levels. The National Longitudinal Survey will examine attitudes toward these jobs and, eventually, the way they fit into the development patterns of disadvantaged youth. The independent, national and regional networks will all examine work sites and types as a major evaluative element. They will seek to determine whether there has been a qualitative improvement in youth work experience under YEDPA. There will be a comprehensive assessment during the school year and the summer of a random sample of job sites nationwide to determine supervision, attendance, work products, satisfaction, enrichment and other job characteristics. This will be combined with theoretical studies which should improve the methods of valuing work output. The studies of YACC in particular will examine the validity of the valuation methodology already in use by Agriculture and Interior. In ultimately doing the

benefits/costs comparisons, it is critically important that output be at least crudely assessed since work experience is a major program element and the work product must be one of its major social benefits.

Youth Participation

The extent of youth participation will be determined from several sources also. The grant narrative review will indicate the composition of youth advisory councils. The independent, national and regional monitors will seek to interview youth and planners to determine the extent of their input, and will measure the extent to which youth have been hired to deliver youth services. The demonstration programs include a national youth council and a series of regional conferences which should shed further light on the degree of youth participation.

Serving Those Most in Need

The targeting of resources on those most in need is, of course, a major goal. Nationwide, the program data will provide a good fix on client characteristics. Important changes have been made in the reporting format which will yield more germane information with only minimal changes in recordkeeping and reporting workloads. Both education and family status information is more complete, which should provide better information on the needs of participants, for instance, whether they have breadwinning responsibilities. The national and regional reviews will include checks on the validity of reported data. In the early YACC monitoring effort, a sample of applicants will be tracked to determine whether selection procedures are fair and equitable. The issue of creaming within broad target groups is a qualitative judgment which will be made by the independent review teams having contacts with prime sponsors. Evaluations of demonstration projects using alternative delivery mechanisms such as community development corporations will indicate, by comparison, whether they are better able or more willing to target resources. The National Longitudinal Survey which will include aptitude and achievement tests will be able to suggest what types of youth get into which types of programs and services.

Avoiding Substitution

The ultimate impact of YEDPA rests on the issue whether the new resources will supplement rather than substitute for those already being used for employment and training of youth. Substitution can take many forms

and it is difficult to pinpoint. The regulations require maintenance of effort under Title I, proscribing any reduction in the proportion of youth served and requiring that the mix of services be maintained. The regional offices will be responsible for enforcing this regulation. The national and regional review teams will also carefully study the substitution issue. The independent process evaluation will pay special attention to this issue as well. National data for YEDPA and Title I will provide a basis for assessing national changes in participation levels and CLMS when it comes available will permit a more sophisticated analysis.

More subtle forms of substitution must also be assessed. At the national level, there has been pressure to absorb projects previously funded from other sources. This substitution must be identified. At the local level, these same pressures will occur, for instance, in supporting services in school. The outside process evaluation will be the chief mechanism for determining the substitution in subgrants at the local level. The end result will be an attempt to assess the share of each YEDPA dollar which ultimately represented a net addition to youth resources.

Minimizing Overhead

The standard financial reporting forms provide the major instrument for controlling overhead. A few minor changes have been made to permit greater detail in supervisory costs. The information will be carefully evaluated. However, administrative expenses are frequently hidden in subgrants or by other obfuscations. Special national and regional studies will examine the expenditures in detail in a sample of areas. The independent review team will be asked to do the same, with special attention to in-school activities. The ultimate aim is to determine how many dollars actually are used for the direct employment or employability development of youth.

Institutional Change

Institutional change is a process which must be assessed qualitatively and judgmentally for the most part. The review of the grant narratives and subsequently of the LEA agreements will suggest the ambitiousness of CETA-school system coordinations. These will be further documented by the onsite investigations. The consideration given to organized labor will be a subject of special reviews. Progress in achieving locally established institutional change goals is to be assessed in end-of-the-year reviews by each prime sponsor, and the national office will assess these in a special report.

Service Deliverers

The choice of delivery agents for the new youth efforts is a major issue given the emphasis in the legislation and regulations on "special consideration" for community and neighborhood-based groups and the specification that 22 percent of YETP funds must be spent in-school under the terms of a LEA-CETA agreement. The review of plans and the various site visits will indicate whether the intents of Congress and the Department of Labor are being met in these regards. More meaningfully, however, the reviews will indicate the effectiveness of procedures for choosing delivery agents and whether greater or less national specification is preferable.

The demonstration projects will test the comparative effectiveness of a variety of delivery agents and the evaluations will hopefully yield some answers about which deliverers are most effective in different tasks. For instance, there will be a structured test of school-to-work transition services offered by the Employment Service, various community-based groups, and the CETA system. Community improvement activities will be carried out by the CETA system, a nonprofit replication corporation, CDC's, and under Federal interagency arrangements between the Department of Labor and the Department of Transportation. The aim will be to assess the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives.

Program Integration

The YEDPA programs are to be integrated with other employment and training activities for youth. Questions here concern the choice of assessment and intake mechanisms, the comparability with existing programs, the attempts to fill gaps in the existing system. Judgments will have to be made based on a careful examination of grant narratives and the national, regional and outside evaluations. A special issue which will demand increasing attention in the spring and summer is the coordination of in-school and summer activities, since a major aim of YEDPA is to provide year-round employment and training packages for disadvantaged youth. Special policy issuances and evaluation procedures will be developed by the summer in addition to those contained in this report.

Implementation

The first year of YEDPA will be dominated by phase-in complications. Basic questions are how fast prime sponsors can move, to what extent early results can be improved in

steady-state operations, and what is the saturation level, if any, of youth activities? The phase-in will be monitored through regular program data. But the judgments about startup implications and saturation levels will have to be made through the process evaluations. Specific questions relating to the interrelation between YEDPA and the summer employment programs must also be resolved. There are, then, questions whether flexibility is being retained for different permanent programs. The issue will, again, have to be resolved through the process evaluations.

Monitoring and Review Schedule

Implementation of this comprehensive evaluation and assessment strategy will have to be carefully coordinated and scheduled to fit in with the operational activities of the Office of Youth Programs. There are certain report dates written into law which provide scheduling targets. An interim report on the progress of YACC is due to Congress February 1, 1978; this is to be a joint effort of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Labor. By March 15, 1978, the Department of Labor is to submit an assessment of the Entitlement program and its progress. This is to be followed by a December 31, 1978, assessment. Because of the immediate concern with youth unemployment and the effectiveness of the new initiatives, the Office of Youth Programs will provide a comprehensive assessment of all YEDPA components on each of these two dates in 1978 and 1979 (as well as Job Corps progress reports). For each of the goals established in the Planning Charter, these reports will synthesize the findings from the entire range of evaluations and assessments. The focus will be on the planning processes, individuals served, the types of services received, the effectiveness of the delivery mechanisms, the implementation process, the costs and the measured impacts. Additionally, knowledge development reports will be prepared on these dates describing the progress in addressing the underlying policy issues. These reports will interpret the evidence from the evaluations and will supplement them with the findings of experimental and theoretical studies. In other words, by March 15, 1978, Congress will be provided: (1) A progress report on all phases of YEDPA planning and early operations structured around the Program Planning Charter; (2) A progress report on the Job Corps augmentation; (3) A knowledge development report addressing the issues raised in the Knowledge Development Plan. Similar, more sophisticated reports will appear December 31, 1978, and on the same dates in 1979.

The detailed schedule for the implementation of the assessment efforts is as follows:

1. Separate issue papers detailing the administrative decisions and considerations in achieving the Planning Charter's articulated goals will be prepared by the end of December 1977. There will be a total of 10 papers of varying lengths. These will provide the foundation for the structured national and regional office reviews as well as

the independent process evaluation. At the same time, the papers will present useful information to the public on the administrative processes and actions under YEDPA. The papers will be updated periodically.

2. The grant narrative or plan review must await submission of a majority of prime sponsor applications since there will be a sponse bias in surveying those which are earliest. The implementation schedule calls for bulk of plans to be approved by the end of 1977. Hence, the review should be possible by early February. The local education agency-CETA agreements are of special interest. These can be submitted up to 2 months after the plan. Review by the Office of Youth Programs staff must, therefore, occur in late February. In both cases, summary information should be available for the March 15, 1978, report to Congress. Additionally, each prime sponsor will assess its own activities and progress in an annual review. These local reviews will be analyzed early in fiscal 1979 to the March 1979 report to Congress.

3. Nationwide program data will be available beginning in April or May 1978, while sample information and enrollment levels will be gathered prior to this through ad hoc procedures. Comprehensive analysis of this information at a national level will be on a quarterly and annual basis. Enrollment data will be reviewed monthly during implementation. Additionally, the data will be sampled and validated by the national, regional and independent process evaluation teams.

4. The Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey will interview as its first wave those who enter the program in the second quarter of Fiscal Year 1978. There will be a 1 year followup only. Adjustments to the questionnaire and the preparation for the new samples will be accomplished in October and November 1978. Some dependable evidence on enrollee characteristics and services received will be available at the end of Fiscal Year 1978. Outcome information will not be useable until 1979 when there are 1 year followups on four quarters of enrollees.

5. The National Longitudinal Survey is basic research tool with a longer-run payoff. Design of the questionnaire and pre-testing will be time-consuming, as will the establishment of sampling procedures which will focus on the disadvantaged and validated information on program participation. Work on these aspects will continue until the first survey in November 1978. The analysis of the first survey results will be available 6-9 months

later. However, the really important findings are the longitudinal ones which will depend on several years tracking of the sample.

6. The outside monitoring and assessment network was organized in September 1977, and evaluators will be in place by the time of the first enrollments. The contract for the outside evaluation calls for interim progress reports which can be included in the March 15, 1978, and December 31, 1978, reports to Congress.

The outside process evaluation for YACC will be initiated in early 1978, with the selection of an evaluation by competitive bid in December 1977.

7. Regional office reviews will focus on specific topics as they become important. For instance, reports on youth participation and the phase-in process will be prepared as early as possible, hopefully before March 15, 1978. Targeting will be analyzed as information becomes available. Worksite evaluations, the integration of YEDPA, with CETA, substitution and overhead issues, institutional change efforts, and other activities will be studies later in Fiscal Year 1978.

8. National office reviews will follow the same general schedule as regional office reviews. The special review of technical assistance efforts and their effectiveness will be completed at the end of fiscal 1978.

9. The impact assessments will be established as early as feasible but will require careful structuring. The control group studies of YACC will be initiated once the program has overcome its growth pains and a residential component is established. Contracting for these studies would occur in the second quarter of 1978 with implementation of the evaluations in late 1978 or early 1979. The Entitlement studies will be in place by the beginning of the projects in January 1978. A pre-survey of the entitlement areas and residents will occur prior to implementation. Research designs will be finalized in November and December 1977. Reports on preliminary progress will be prepared for the March 15, and December 31, 1978, submissions to Congress. A long-run followup of enrollees will be designed, with a decision on its implementation depending on the extent that school completion rates are affected by the guaranteed jobs. The studies of worksites will be conducted in the spring and summer of 1978. Contracting for this evaluation will

be done in December 1978 and January 1979. Finally, each of the smaller demonstration programs will have an evaluation system built in. Since most of the projects will be getting underway in the second quarter of Fiscal Year 1978, a substantive report cannot be made until December 1978, with assessments of outcome the following year.

The wealth of information which will be gathered will be presented in many different forms for different audiences. The synthesis reports for Congress by the Office of Youth Programs are critical in organizing and presenting the information. Undoubtedly, there will be delays in specific elements of the assessment package. It will be a formidable challenge to integrate the results. Clearly, however, a diverse array of monitoring and evaluation approaches are being implemented, with a structured approach which should yield a high caliber product. The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act will be more comprehensively evaluated than any other employment and training effort in recent years, and the result will hopefully be a significant improvement in the knowledge base for use by Congress and the Administration in setting national policy and by prime sponsors in designing and improving local programs.

THIS PLAN IS SUBJECT TO FURTHER REVISION AS NEW NEEDS ARE PERCEIVED OR OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTATION. IT DOES NOT REPRESENT A COMMITMENT OF PRIORITIES OR RESOURCES BUT IS RATHER A GENERAL BLUEPRINT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1977